

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2001

LB 536

SENATOR DIERKS: My understanding, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And there is no definition of what it means in the legislation dealing with the LUST Fund, is there?

SENATOR DIERKS: I don't know that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think that what Senator Raikes was getting at could realistically be true, that there would always be an obligation to pay something out of that fund...

SENATOR DIERKS: Could be.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...no matter how much it was?

SENATOR DIERKS: It could be.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So why is the term "unobligated" there? What purpose does it serve other than it being the language that might be found some place else?

SENATOR DIERKS: Because if you...if you have some funds that are not obligated, why, those funds then...it reduces the amount of reliance that the...well, I think the...I think the amendment that he had was to shut off the funding at \$15 million and start it up with \$700 million or \$750, and the Coordsen amendment had \$800. And if those funds are not...some of those funds are not obligated, why, you wouldn't have to count that \$15 million...that ceiling.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you could have more than \$15 million.

SENATOR DIERKS: I think you probably could, but that would be...unless you were obligated, see? I don't...I really don't think that the amendment, the amendment that either Senator Raikes or Senator Coordsen had is going to have that much effect on the legis...on the...on the bill or the funding mechanism that we use in LB 536. I don't think it will ever get to that point. I think it will be used up before it gets to \$15 million.